



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,424	08/30/2001	Ichiro Futamura	09792909-5127	1855
26263	7590	02/15/2006	EXAMINER	
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/944,424	Applicant(s) FUTAMURA ET AL	
	Examiner Christopher A. Revak	Art Unit 2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2005.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14 and 16-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14 and 16-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
 1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's amendments and corresponding arguments filed on November 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has argued that Dulude fails to teach "template information encrypted using a public key of the personal identification certificate authority". The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant has cited portions of Dulude which indeed do not disclose of teach "template information encrypted using a public key of the personal identification certificate authority", however referring to column 6, lines 58-65, it is recited of a biometric certificate that includes encrypted registration biometric data, also known as template data, that requires a public key of the certificate authority to decrypt the biometric data. Although Dulude recites that the biometric data is contained within the encrypted biometric certificate encrypted by the certificate authority's public key, the teachings still anticipates the applicant's claim language and the applicant's claim language is not distinguished from the teachings of Dulude.

2. The rejection of claims 14-21 and 24 under 35 USC 101 for claiming non-statutory subject matter is hereby withdrawn.
3. The examiner has maintained the obviousness-type double patenting rejections.

### ***Double Patenting***

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the

unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of copending Application No. 09/944,192. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 of the instant application are envisioned by copending Application No. 09/944,192 in that claims 1-40 of copending Application No. 09/944,192 contains all the limitations of the instant application. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from copending Application No. 09/944,192 claims, and as such, is unpatentable for obvious-type doubling patenting.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 09/944,192. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-3,5-14, and

16-24 of the instant application are envisioned by copending Application No. 09/943,893 in that claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 09/943,893 contains all the limitations of the instant application. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from copending Application No. 09/943,893 claims, and as such, is unpatentable for obvious-type doubling patenting.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of copending Application No. 09/943,858. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 of the instant application are envisioned by copending Application No. 09/943,858 in that claims 1-29 of copending Application No. 09/943,858 contains all the limitations of the instant application. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from copending Application No. 09/943,858 claims, and as such, is unpatentable for obvious-type doubling patenting.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 09/943,683. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-3,5-14, and

16-24 of the instant application are envisioned by copending Application No. 09/943,683 in that claims 1-30 of copending Application No. 09/943,683 contains all the limitations of the instant application. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 of the instant application therefore are not patentably distinct from copending Application No. 09/943,683 claims, and as such, is unpatentable for obvious-type doubling patenting.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-3,5-14, and 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dulude et al, U.S. Patent 6,310,966.

As per claims 1,13,22, and 24, Dulude et al discloses of method, system, and computer program embodied on a computer readable medium for executing personal authentication by comparing templates with sampling information input by a user. The templates being personal identification data acquired beforehand. A personal identification certificate authority generates and issues a person identification certificate

having data items in accordance with a predetermined format and stores template information including the templates. An entity acquires the person identification certificate and executes a person authentication process on the basis of the templates of the acquired person identification certificate (column 3, lines 32-43 and column 4, lines 55-65). The teachings of Dulude et al disclose of encrypting the template information using a public key of the personal identification certificate authority and stored in the person identification certificate to be generated by the personal identification certificate authority (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2--8; and Figure 2, Issuer Name).

As per claims 2 and 14, it is taught by Dulude et al that the person identification certificate issued by the personal identification certificate authority includes a digital signature added by the personal identification certificate authority (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 13-18; and as shown in Figure 2, item #22).

As per claim 3, Dulude et al teaches of the person identification certificate issued by the person identification certificate authority includes, as indispensable data, an identifier capable of identifying the person identification certificate and the identification data of the person to be authenticated on the basis of the person identification certificate (column 4, lines 19-25 and Figure 2, items # 18 and #20).

As per claim 16, the teachings of Dulude et al disclose of encrypting the template information using a public key of the personal identification certificate authority and stored in the person identification certificate to be generated by the personal

identification certificate authority (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2--8; and Figure 2, Issuer Name).

As per claim 5, Dulude et al discloses of encrypting template information using a public key of the entity and stored in the person identification certificate to be generated by the personal identification certificate authority (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2-8; and Figure 2).

As per claims 6 and 17, it is taught by Dulude et al of encrypting template information using a common key and storing in the person identification certificate to be generated by the identification certificate authority. The common key being, encrypted using a public key of the entity and stored in the person identification certificate (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2-8; and Figure 2).

As per claims 7 and 18, it is disclosed by Dulude et al of encrypting template information and storing encryption algorithm information in the generated person identification certificate by the personal identification certificate authority (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2-8; and Figure 2).

As per claims 8 and 19, Dulude et al discloses that the person identification certificate generated by the personal identification certificate authority stores personal information of the person to be authenticated (column 3, lines 32-43; column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2-8; and Figure 2).

As per claims 9 and 20, Dulude et al teaches of the person identification certificate generated by the personal identification certificate authority stores a public key certificate information of the person to be authenticated, identification data of a



public key certificate of the person to be authenticated (column 3, lines 32-43; column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2-8; and Figure 2).

As per claims 10 and 21, Dulude et al discloses of the person identification certificate generated by the personal identification certificate authority stores link information linked to a public key certificate used in data communication or data processing which is executed on a condition that the personal authentication is successfully executed on the basis of the person identification certificate (column 4, lines 55-65; column 6, lines 2-8; and Figure 2).

As per claim 11, the teachings of Dulude et al disclose of the template storing fingerprint information, retina pattern information, iris pattern information, and voice print information (column 4, lines 27-30).

As per claim 12, Dulude et al discloses of an entity service provider makes a deal with a user who has been identified on the basis of the person identification certificate. A user device accessed by a user who has been identified on the basis of the person identification certificate, or the person identification certificate authority (column 4, lines 55-60 and Figure 2, Issuer Name and Issuer ID).

As per claim 23, it is disclosed in the teachings of Dulude et al of encryption processing means for decrypting encrypted templates stored in the person identification certificate (column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 19).

***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR  
*CU*  
February 9, 2006

*cel*  
Christopher Revak  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2131

*2/9/06*